

REMARKS

This is responsive to an Office Action mailed on November 16, 2007. The Office Action rejected claims 1-34.

Before addressing the rejections raised in the Office Action, it should be noted claims 1-22 have been amended to claim a “computer readable storage medium” which is believed preferred under U.S. practice. Support for this language is found in the Specification at least at page 9, line 13 – page 10, line 217. Approval of these claim amendments is respectfully requested.

The Office Action first reports that claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, while also citing a passage of the Specification at page 8, lines 25-28 in reaching this conclusion. With this Amendment, Applicants have deleted the cited passage. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action next reports that claims 1-34 are rejected as being anticipated by “Retreiving Collocations from Text:Xtract” by Smadja, F. Referring to first to claim 1, this claim recites, a computer readable storage medium including instructions readable by a computer which, when implemented, cause the computer to generate synonymous collocations comprising the steps of:

extracting collocations from a monolingual corpus;
generating candidate synonymous collocations from the extracted collocations;
selecting synonymous collocations from the candidate synonymous collocations as a function of translation information; and
providing an output based at least in part on the synonymous collocations. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully believed Smadja does teach, suggest or render obvious, at least, selecting synonymous collocations from the candidate synonymous collocations as a function of translation information as recited invention of claim 1. The Office Action reports that this element is taught by Smadja at step 1.3 in section 6.1, pages 153-155. These cited pages have been reviewed and no reference can be found that synonymous collocations are selected based on any form of

translation information. Instead, it appears that Smadja uses part of speech information to ascertain synonymous collocations as found in the last paragraph of page 153 to equation 1b on page 155. No where in this description is translation information used. Any reference in the documents appear to be either showing various translations such as in Table 1, or obtaining synonymous collocations in a multilingual environment. Neither of which teach, suggest or render obvious the invention recited by claim 1 where synonymous collocations are selected based on translation information.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable. Each of the remaining independent claims 19, 23 and 31 also recite language similar to that discussed above, and accordingly, it is believed these claims are also allowable, at least for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 2-18, 20-22, 24-30 and 32-34 each depend from claims 1, 19, 23 and 31, respectively. Each of these claims recite further features, which when combined with their respective independent claim, and any intervening claims, are also believed separately patentable. In particular, many of these claims recite specific features related to translation information. Since, as discussed above, Smadja lacks any teaching regarding the use of translation information, these claims are clearly separately patentable.

The foregoing remarks are intended to assist the Office in examining the application and in the course of explanation may employ shortened or more specific or variant descriptions of some of the claim language. Such descriptions are not intended to limit the scope of the claims; the actual claim language should be considered in each case. Furthermore, the remarks are not to be considered exhaustive of the facets of the invention which are rendered patentable, being only examples of certain advantageous features and differences, which applicant's attorney chooses to mention at this time. For the foregoing reasons, applicant reserves the right to submit additional evidence showing the distinction between applicant's invention to be unobvious in view of the prior art.

Furthermore, in commenting on the references and in order to facilitate a better understanding of the differences that are expressed in the claims, certain details of distinction between the same and the present invention have been mentioned, even though such differences

do not appear in all of the claims. It is not intended by mentioning any such unclaimed distinctions to create any implied limitations in the claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the present application is in allowable form. Allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

An extension of time is hereby requested for responding to the Office Action. An online charge authorization for the extension of time fee is included herewith.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:

Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

SMK:bms